

2014

Push and pull factors in determining the consumers' motivations for choosing wedding banquet venues: A case study in Chongqing, China

Ling Guan
Iowa State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd>



Part of the [Advertising and Promotion Management Commons](#), [Business Administration, Management, and Operations Commons](#), [Management Sciences and Quantitative Methods Commons](#), and the [Marketing Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Guan, Ling, "Push and pull factors in determining the consumers' motivations for choosing wedding banquet venues: A case study in Chongqing, China" (2014). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 13851.
<https://lib.dr.iastate.edu/etd/13851>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Iowa State University Capstones, Theses and Dissertations at Iowa State University Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Iowa State University Digital Repository. For more information, please contact digirep@iastate.edu.

**Push and pull factors in determining the consumers' motivations for choosing
wedding banquet venues: A case study in Chongqing, China**

by

Ling Guan

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major: Hospitality Management

Program of Study Committee:
Liang Tang, Major Professor
Tianshu Zheng
Mack Shelley

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2014

Copyright © Ling Guan, 2014. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Problem Statement	2
Purpose of Study	4
Research Questions	4
Significance of Study	5
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	6
Overview	6
Wedding Banquet Venues	6
Push-pull Theory	7
Push Factors	8
Pull Factors	9
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	13
Introduction	13
Use of Human Subjects	13
Participants	14
Survey Instrument	14
Data Collection	16
Data Analysis	18
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS	20
Overview	20
Descriptive Analysis	20
Exploratory Factor Analysis	24
ANOVA Results	32
Pearson Correlation Analysis	37
CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS	39
Overview	39

Conclusion	39
Implications	43
Limitations and Future Study	46
REFERENCES	48
APPENDIX A. HUMAN SUBJECTS FORMS	52
APPENDIX B. COPY OF TRAINING STATEMENT	54
APPENDIX C. QUESTIONNAIRE	67

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 4.1. Demographic Descriptive Analysis ($N=172$)	21
Table 4.2. Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation for push factors	26
Table 4.3. Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation for pull factors	29
Table 4.4. ANOVA for comparison of push and pull factors by relationship group	33
Table 4.5. ANOVA for comparison of push and pull factors by personal monthly income group	34
Table 4.6. ANOVA for comparison of push and pull factors by wedding banquet budget group	36
Table 4.7. Correlation analysis of push and pull factors	37

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are several people I could never forget who have helped me throughout my studies and made my life become more colorful than my expectations. First and foremost, I would like to thank my parents and grandfather who always trust me and support me with their endless love and patience. I could not realize my dreams without their constant encouragement. In addition, my sincere gratitude goes out to all of my friends at Iowa State University whose friendship and support have helped me overcome the challenges I have met.

Thank you to my major professor, Dr. Liang Tang, for her guidance and understanding throughout this research that has encouraged me to seek greater knowledge of hospitality management. Without her suggestions for further development I would not have completed this paper efficiently.

I'd also like to thank my committee members, Dr. Tianshu Zheng and Dr. Mack Shelley, for their support and insight throughout their courses that were closely related to this research. Without inspiration from them, this paper would not be the same.

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to investigate the push and pull factors in consumers' decisions in choosing wedding banquet venues in Chongqing, China. The objectives of this research were to identify push and pull factors that motivated decision makers and to explore the relationships between the factors across decision makers' demographic variables including "relationship with the new couple", "personal monthly income", and "wedding banquet budget". This study made the first attempts to utilize push-pull theory to investigate customer motivation in choosing wedding banquet venues.

Four types of analysis were utilized in the methodology chapter. First, descriptive analysis was used to provide a summary of the demographic characteristics of the participants. Next, exploratory factor analysis was conducted to identify the push and pull constructs used throughout the study. Third, ANOVA was utilized to determine whether significant differences existed between push and pull factors based on the demographic variables "relationship with the new couple", "personal monthly income", and "wedding banquet budget". Finally, Pearson bivariate correlation analysis was conducted to identify the relationships between the push and pull factors. The present research identified four push factors ("seeking relaxation and knowledge", "fulfilling prestige", "escaping from daily routine", and "social networking") derived from the extracted 10 push items and six pull factors ("budget", "atmosphere", "facilities", "wedding services", "transportation", and "service and quality") derived from the extracted 16 pull items, and failed to find a significant relationship among these push and pull factors at the $p < .05$ level. This thesis concludes with a discussion of the findings, implications for practice, and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

The wedding reception is a fundamental part of weddings in many cultures (Lau & Hui, 2010). The wedding banquet, a private event with relatives and guests, is held after the marriage ceremony or the signing of the marriage certificate at the government marriage registration (Choi, 2002). During the reception, couples have the opportunity to share their good fortune with family members and friends with whom they have close relationships (Post, 2006).

High-priced banquet activities at wedding receptions have significantly contributed to the growth in the overall profits of the food and beverage (F&B) departments of hotels (Adler & Chien, 2004). Marsan (2000) indicated that almost 70% of the food and beverage revenue of hotels in the U.S. is generated by banquets. Fifty percent of these profits come from weddings in the United States. Perkowski (2012) indicated that over 10 million weddings occur each year in China due to its large population, representing almost five times more weddings than those that take place in the U.S. The wedding industry in China was a \$57 billion business in 2011, although the size of the industry varies by type of wedding service, i.e., wedding banquet market, wedding planning market, etc. Traditionally, restaurants and hotel ballrooms have been the most popular venues for wedding banquets in China. According to data collected by the Hong Kong Tourism Board (HKTb), the revenue from F&B departments represented 30% of total hotel revenues from 2003 to 2007 (HKTb, 2004-2008). A recent survey

conducted by ESDlife, an upgraded public-private partnership agency in Hong Kong, revealed that the wedding banquet business represented a revenue of \$755 million each year in Hong Kong and that from 2003 to 2007, the average amount that a couple was willing to spend on the wedding banquet alone was approximately \$15,900 (ESDlife, 2007).

The city of Chongqing is a major city in Southwest China. Chongqing is one of the four direct-controlled municipalities in China, along with Beijing, Shanghai, and Tianjin. An Economic Statistics Report released by the Chongqing Statistics Bureau (2012) indicated that Chongqing's gross domestic product (GDP) grew from 1.001113 trillion (\$158.9 billion) in 2011 to 1.146 trillion yuan (\$184.23 billion) in 2012, which was the second fastest growth rate in China (Li, 2013). Moreover, the registered household population of Chongqing reached 33.2981 million in 2011 (Luo, 2012). Against such a background of economic development, it is understandable that consumers in Chongqing have greater disposable income and are inclined to spend significant amounts of money on weddings in order to achieve a truly memorable event.

Problem Statement

Despite the significant growth of the wedding industry in China, very few studies have focused on couple behavior with regard to the selection of the wedding banquet venue (Lau & Hui, 2010). In order to maximize profits, hotel and restaurant managers require a comprehension of customers' motivations when choosing wedding banquet venues and should take these motivations into serious consideration.

Push-pull theory has been widely applied to tourism research, and specifically to traveler motivations. The theory provides a framework for examining customers' motivations for choosing to visit specific locations by analyzing two aspects: factors that push customers into making decisions via internal forces such as fulfilling prestige and gaining knowledge (Mohammad & Som, 2010), and factors that pull customers to choose desired locations via external forces, such as the attributes of the destination (Crompton, 1979; Dann, 1977; Jang & Cai, 2002; Yuan & McDonald, 1990). Moreover, previous research has also identified push-pull factors in different sectors of the hospitality industry (Jang & Cai, 2002; Yuan & McDonald, 1990). However, to the knowledge of the author, no previous studies have applied push-pull theory to the wedding banquet context. This does not mean that it is inapplicable to utilize this theory to examine customers' motivations for choosing wedding banquet venues. In fact, the process by which consumers select travel destinations is similar to the process of selecting a wedding banquet venue.

Specifically, before making a decision, customers consider the internal forces and external forces that push and pull them to choose a venue. For example, a recent study conducted by Lau and Hui (2010) utilized intrinsic and extrinsic selection attributes consisting of 25 venue attributes and 11 personal attributes to analyze the selection of wedding banquet venues. It was concluded that among the 25 venue attributes, employee attitude was rated the most important. Among 11 personal attributes, the first impression was the most influential attribute and an auspicious wedding date was the least influential.

Purpose of Study

This study aimed to investigate the push and pull factors in consumers' decisions in choosing wedding banquet venues in Chongqing, China. More specifically, the objectives of the study were to:

- identify the primary push factors that motivate decision makers when selecting wedding banquet venues;
- identify the primary pull factors that motivate decision makers when selecting wedding banquet venues;
- explore the relationship between push and pull factors across demographic variables including “relationship with the new couple”, “personal monthly income”, and “wedding banquet budget”.

Research Questions

The following questions were used to guide this study:

1. What are the influencing push factors for decision makers when they choose wedding banquet venues?
2. What are the influencing pull factors for decision makers when they choose wedding banquet venues?
3. Are there any differences in the push and pull factors across demographic variables including “relationship with the new couple”, “personal monthly income”, and “wedding banquet budget”?
4. Are there any relationships among the push and pull factors in the study?

Significance of study

In the vast and lucrative wedding market, it is critical for hotel and restaurant management staff to identify the factors that are involved in consumers' motivations for choosing wedding banquet venues. In spite of the significance of the wedding business in the hospitality industry in Beijing and Shanghai, few studies have been conducted regarding wedding banquet venues in Chongqing. In particular, very little is known about the motivational factors of consumers in the wedding industry of Chongqing. To fill this knowledge gap, this study made the first attempts to utilize push-pull theory to investigate customer motivation in choosing banquet venues, an approach that is novel in its field. In order to effectively market a particular venue, it is indispensable to understand both push and pull factors and the relationship between them. Insight into the interaction of these two dimensions can help marketers and restaurant and hotel developers segment potential customer groups and determine the most successful coupling of push and pull factors. Moreover, applying push-pull theory to the selection of wedding banquet venues enriches both the theoretical understanding and the field of wedding research, and can thus provide effective marketing strategies to practitioners in the wedding banquet venue business.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview

This chapter provides a review of literature on wedding banquet research and push-pull theory. The first section offers a review of existing studies in the wedding industry context, while the second section discusses customer motivation through the lens of push and pull factors, respectively.

Wedding Banquet Venues

Selecting a wedding banquet venue is a significant decision-making process for a couple. To date, the criteria for selection a wedding banquet venue have been addressed only in trade magazines, with the exception of studies conducted by Lau and Hui (2010) which was focused on selection attributes of wedding banquet venues in Hong Kong. The wedding banquet is an elaborate and expensive occasion and its goal is twofold: to create a celebratory atmosphere and to ensure the physical and emotional comfort of guests (Post, 2006). Bowdin et al. (2006) indicated that the choices that consumers make regarding wedding venues are determined from cognitive and affective perspectives. Similarly, Van der Wagen (2005) identified several aspects of an event that should be considered when developing venue or site specifications, including facilities and services; location; capacity of the site or venue; creative themes or decor; availability; and accessibility. As such, the venue is a key element in planning a wedding banquet.

Despite the significance of the venue in planning an event, very few studies have addressed the process of selecting a venue for a wedding banquet. Furthermore, early research regarding Chinese restaurant venues focused primarily on the dining selection preferences of specific groups of customers (e.g., mature tourists). Thus, there is limited information available regarding the process of selecting wedding banquet venues.

Push-pull Theory

Push-pull theory has been widely used in previous studies, primarily those focused on the travel industry and, more specifically, the fields of theme parks and travel destinations. The majority of discussions in the existing tourist motivation literature, such as visitor satisfaction (Mohamed & Othman, 2012), have revolved around the concepts of push and pull factors. To the knowledge of the current author, no researchers have applied push-pull theory to studies focusing on wedding planning, and the significance of examining this context utilizing push-pull theory has been previously ignored. Push-pull theory offers a framework consisting of push factors and pull factors with the purpose of examining the motivations underlying tourist behavior such as tourists' decision-making behaviors (Dann, 1977; Klenosky, 2002). In this framework, push factors refer to the specific forces that influence a person's decision to travel, while pull factors refer to the forces that influence a person's decision regarding which specific destination to select (Kim, Lee & Klenosky, 2003).

The literature regarding push-pull theory has been enriched over the past 30 years. Crompton (1979) briefly identified seven push motives consisting of escape, self-exploration, relaxation, prestige, regression, kinship-enhancement, and social interaction;

and two pull motives consisting of novelty and education. As a result of Crompton's earlier efforts, many researchers have subsequently identified the forces that underlie the dimensions and structure of customers' motivations in different segments of the hospitality industry (Jang & Cai, 2002; Yuan & McDonald, 1990). For example, according to a study conducted in four countries (Japan, France, West Germany, and the United Kingdom), Yuan and McDonald (1990) identified five push factors from 29 motivational items (escape, novelty, prestige, enhancement of kinship relationships, and relaxation) and seven pull factors from 53 attraction items (budget; culture and history; wilderness; ease of travel; cosmopolitan environment; facilities; and hunting). The results indicated that individuals from various countries might travel for similar reasons, but that their reasons for choosing a specific place and the level of importance attached to these factors may differ among participants from different countries. Furthermore, with the development of literature in the hospitality industry, an increasing number of push and pull factors have been identified, such as knowledge-gaining and transportation.

Push Factors

Push factors have been conceptualized as motivational factors or needs that arise due to a tension in the motivational system (Kim, Lee & Klenosky, 2003). Baloglu and Uysal (1996) stated that the majority of push factors, such as social interaction, originate from the intangible or intrinsic desires of individual travelers. As discussed above, escape, prestige, enhancement of relationships, and relaxation are primary push factors to consider in investigating customers' motivations in the hospitality industry (Jang & Cai, 2002; Yuan & McDonald, 1990).

Crompton (1979) identified fulfilling prestige as one of the primary push motives and defined it as the symbol of an elite lifestyle. According to a study conducted by Mohammad & Som (2010), it is widely accepted that fulfilling prestige is a push factor in which people are motivated to pursue prestige, increase social status, visit a place that their friends also visit, and visit a place that would impress their friends and family. The results showed that fulfilling prestige was the most important push factor and that gaining knowledge was the fourth most important pull factor in the study.

Iso-Ahola (1982, 1989) suggested that two basic motivational dimensions of leisure or tourism behavior, escaping from daily routine and seeking relaxation, simultaneously influence people's leisure behaviors. For instance, a tourist may want to visit a place to escape from his or her personal environment (e.g. to be away from home) and to seek out physical and psychological rewards in personal dimensions (e.g. to relax spiritually and physically) (Ryan, 1991). For another example, when a couple selects a venue for their wedding banquet, they might select a place that reflects their personalities and that will ensure the physical and emotional comfort of their guests (Post, 2006).

Pull Factors

In contrast, pull factors have been conceptualized as the features, attractions, or attributes of the destination itself (Kim, Lee & Klenosky, 2002). As discussed above, Yuan and Mc Donald (1990) identified seven pull factors in order to develop a profile of pull factors for tourism destinations, including budget; culture and history; wilderness; ease of travel; cosmopolitan environment; facilities; and hunting. Furthermore, Fakeye and Crompton (1991) identified six pull factor domains from 32 attributes by utilizing a

sample of visitors to a well-known winter destination in Texas. The identified pull factors were social opportunities and attractions; natural and cultural amenities; accommodations and transportation; infrastructure, foods, and friendly people; physical amenities and recreation activities; and bars and evening entertainment. They concluded that the perceived importance of the attribute domains differed among non-visitors, first-time visitors, and repeat visitors.

Bowdin et al. (2006) proposed that selecting a venue is a crucial decision that ultimately determines many of the elements of an event. Callan and Hoyes (2000) investigated the requirements that an event organizer should consider when selecting appealing venues for different types of events, including availability, location, convenience of parking, cleanliness, lighting, decoration, audio equipment, and beverage prices. Lau and Hui (2010), as practitioners in the field of wedding banquets, indicated that the selection attributes discussed in hotel ballroom and restaurant studies were primarily related to availability, location, atmospherics, facilities, food, service and price. Therefore, this study explored the facilities, service, transportation, budget, and attraction of wedding venues in detail.

Facilities and service consist of lighting/ambiance, size of venue, audio equipment, bridal room facilities, photography service, and bridal limousine service. Callan and Hoyes (2000) suggested that capacity, which is tangible and measurable, should be a primary logistics requirement of an event. It is imperative that wedding banquets involve the use of audio equipment and lighting. Adler and Chienm (2004) stated that since wedding packages simplify the wedding planning process for the couple and increase food and beverage revenues, hotels should provide professional service including bridal

room facilities, photography services, and bridal limousine service. In terms of transportation, the location of the venue and the availability of parking space is another significant factor that influences customer motivation. Bull (1994) proposed that a desirable location obviously increases the value of a lodging product to guests. Moreover, Callan and Hoyes (2000) demonstrated that an appealing wedding banquet location is not only beautiful but also convenient for all guests attending the event. Bowdin et al. (2006) identified that the convenience of a location also involves the availability of parking.

Budget is the cost for customers to purchase a wedding banquet reception and includes food price, beverage price, and equipment expenses. Lockyer (2005) found that price is the most important consideration in the selection process. Nevertheless, Callan and Hoyes (2000) proposed that the provision of beverage service that was required to be organized separately increased the cost of a banquet. A wedding banquet differs from other events in that it requires the construction of a stage and backdrop. In addition, the expenses for equipment such as a bridal limousine and photographer typically make wedding costs greater than those of other events.

Attraction refers to features and attributes of the venue itself and is comprised of cleanliness, food quality, availability, decoration, employee attitude (service), and menu variety in this study. Liu and Jang (2009) identified that food quality includes food taste, freshness, temperature, presentation, and options. In addition, the researchers pointed out that cleanliness and decoration with artifacts serve as implicit and explicit signals conveyed to users. Auty (1992) argued that food type and quality are the most frequently cited choice variables for selecting a restaurant regardless of the occasion. Furthermore, according to a study conducted in Hong Kong, Chu and Choi (2000) indicated that

employee attitude is the one of the most frequently considered variable. Another factor which is easily ignored is availability, which was identified by Forsyth (1999) as the matching of an intention and a vacancy. In contrast to planning regular dining activities, a wedding couple generally faces challenges in booking a venue at a time that coincides with their desired dates. Typically, Chinese couples are required to schedule a reservation far in advance, sometimes up to a year or more prior to their reception.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes how a quantitative approach was utilized to investigate push and pull factors in determining consumers' motivations for choosing wedding banquet venues in Chongqing, China. Surveys were employed to investigate the importance of the motivation attributes of the decision makers in the wedding banquet planning process. The software Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was conducted to analyze the collected data to achieve a reliable outcome.

Use of Human Subjects

An Application for Approval of Research Involving Humans was submitted to the Institutional Review Board of Iowa State University. This research was deemed exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations because the key personnel that assisted in collecting data in this study (the general manager, banquet executive and manager's secretary of the Chongqing Bayu Humble House Ltd. in China) provided a training statement which indicated that they had promised to collect data in a manner consistent with the provisions of the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health's "Field Training Guides for Data Collectors" in a Chinese language version. A copy of the approval is shown in Appendix A and a copy of the training statement in both English and Chinese versions can be found in Appendix B.

Participants

All of the participants were the decision makers for wedding banquets held in the Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. during the Chinese Spring Festival in 2014. These decision makers included wedding couples, parents, relatives, and friends who were involved in the decision making process and who were at least 18 years of age. Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. was established in 2006 and has an outstanding reputation as one of the most popular high-priced Chinese restaurants in Chongqing. The most significant reason why this particular restaurant was selected to investigate wedding banquet decision makers is that most Chinese are willing to spend a large amount of money on wedding banquets as a symbol of the wealth of wedding hosting families. For this reason, all decision makers for wedding banquets in Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. during this period were invited to participate. The total sample population consisted of 415 customers.

Survey Instrument

Pre-test

Potential survey questions were developed based on previous research. In order to ensure the validity of the study, a pre-test involving a sample of six graduate students in the Hospitality Management Department of Iowa State University in Ames, Iowa, was conducted to refine the push and pull factor items that were generated based on the literature review. These students were consulted due to their knowledge of push and pull factors and their ability to discern reliable and valid push and pull motivation factor items.

Survey

The survey consisted of three sections: push factor questions, pull factor questions, and demographic questions. In the first section, 13 push factor questions were employed to investigate decision makers' reasons for selecting a wedding banquet venue with a 7-point scale of agreement-disagreement (1 = strongly disagree...7 = strongly agree). The 13 items covered the six categories of push factors discussed above in the literature review section and included "fulfilling prestige" and "gaining knowledge" (Mohammad & Som, 2010); "escaping from daily routine" and "seeking relaxation" (Iso-Ahola, 1982, 1989); and "enhancement of relationships" and "relaxation" (Jang & Cai, 2002; Yuan & McDonald, 1990).

In the second section, 17 pull factor items were utilized to investigate the importance of the attributes of the banquet venue with a 7-point scale of agreement – disagreement (1 = strongly disagree...7 = strongly agree). The 17 items covered four categories mentioned in the literature review section, including "facilities" and "budget" (Yuan & Mc Donald, 1990); and "attraction" and "transportation" (Fakeye & Crompton, 1991).

The demographic information of the participants was collected in the last section of the questionnaire. Respondents were asked to provide personal information regarding gender, age, educational level, relationship with the wedding couple, personal monthly income, wedding banquet budget, and acceptable menu price per table (excluding beverage service).

Back-translation

A Chinese language version of the survey was developed through back-translation, which is the most common and highly recommended procedure for translating. Back-translation involves translating from the target language (e.g. Chinese) back to the source language (e.g. English). The equivalence between the source and target versions can then be evaluated (Brislin, 1970; Chapman et al., 1979).

Following a review of the literature (Brislin, 1970; Bracken & Barona, 1991; McDermott & Palchanes, 1994; Temple, 1997; Chang et al., 1999), suitable translation procedures were developed and utilized by two translators as described below:

1. The first version was translated by the present author.
2. Blind back-translation was completed by a Chinese graduate student in the Hospitality Management Department of ISU, who was able to write both Chinese and English equally well.
3. The second version was developed by repeating steps 1 and 2 until the Chinese version was acceptably equivalent to the English version.
4. Review and modification of the target language version was completed by a bilingual specialist.

Data Collection

Data were collected through paper-based surveys handed out from February 8 to February 28, 2014 by a general manager and a banquet executive charged with distributing the surveys to the decision makers for wedding banquets in the Chongqing

Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. The manager's secretary was responsible for inputting the information collected into an Excel spreadsheet for the subsequent data analysis.

The Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. features 39 tables and a large crystal stage for couples to hold wedding ceremonies in the banquet hall on the third floor. Each table can accommodate up to 10 guests. Traditionally, there are two honored host tables in the hall that are reserved for the couple, their parents, and their closest relatives from each family. These two tables are decorated with red (the color that symbolizes weddings in Chinese culture) tablecloths while the other guest tables are decorated with light yellow tablecloths. Guest to be seated at the host tables were invited to participate in the study, because most or all of these guests may be decision makers in the wedding reception planning process. Prior to the banquet, the primary invitation to participate was extended by the general manager and banquet staff of the Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. via face-to-face interactions with potential decision makers. The content and purpose of this study were explained in-person to every participant, and incentives were offered to promote participation. Prior to completing the survey, participants were informed that they could skip any questions without penalty if they felt uncomfortable answering particular questions. Following the wedding banquet, the questionnaires were distributed to the invitees who were at least 18 years of age. The questionnaire consisted of six pages, the first containing a cover letter including an introduction to the researcher, a brief explanation of the purpose of the survey, and informed consent information for the study. The second to fourth pages contained specific push and pull questions while the fifth and sixth pages were dedicated to the collection of demographic data. The survey

was closed on February 28, 2014. A total of 172 surveys were returned, for a total response rate of 41.45%.

Data Analysis

SPSS Version 19.0 was used for all analyses. Due to the paper-based survey mode of questionnaire delivery, it was necessary for data entry to be completed by the manager's secretary by inputting responses into an Excel file which was imported into SPSS for analysis. Prior to analysis, all data from participants aged younger than 18 and from non-decision-makers were removed from the data set.

Descriptive statistics were gathered from the demographic data of respondents in order to provide a summary of the sample. Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was employed to identify the primary themes of push and pull factors. Norris and Lecavalier (2010) stated that EFA, a technique within factor analysis, aims to identify the underlying relationships between measured variables. Cronbach's alpha was calculated to ensure the reliability of the measurement scales. Nunnally (1978) indicated that a Cronbach's alpha of 0.70 is an acceptable reliability coefficient to represent the level of internal consistency among factors. In accordance with Karser's (1974) criterion, only factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 were retained. Items with loadings greater than .50 were accepted as adequate elements of the construct for further analysis (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). In addition, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was utilized to determine whether significant differences existed between push and pull factors based on the demographic variables "relationship with the new couple", "personal monthly income", and "wedding

banquet budget”. Finally, Pearson bivariate correlation analysis was conducted to identify the relationships between the push and pull factors.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Overview

This chapter provides an overview of the results of the data analysis. The overview consists of four sections including descriptive analysis, exploratory factor analysis, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Pearson correlation analysis.

The first section provides a summary of the demographic characteristics of the participants. The second section summarizes the results of the exploratory factor analysis and establishes the push and pull constructs utilized throughout the study. The third section determines whether significant differences exist among push and pull factors using ANOVA analysis based on the demographic variables “relationship with the new couple”, “personal monthly income”, and “wedding banquet budget”. The last section identifies the relationship between push and pull factors using Pearson correlation analysis.

Descriptive Analysis

The demographics of decision makers participating in the study were descriptively analyzed based on seven categories including “gender”, “age”, “education level”, “relationship with the new couple”, “personal monthly income”, “wedding banquet budget”, and “acceptable menu price per table (excluding beverage costs)”. A summary of the descriptive variables is shown in Table 4.1. Among the 172 usable responses, 100% of the respondents reported that they had participated in the decision

Table 4.1

Demographic Descriptive Analysis (N=172)

Variables	Number	Percentage
<i>Gender</i>		
Male	89	51.70%
Female	83	48.30%
<i>Age</i>		
18-25	32	18.60%
26-30	32	18.60%
31-35	3	1.70%
36-45	9	5.20%
46-55	93	54.10%
56-65	3	1.70%
65 and above	0	0
<i>Education level</i>		
High school	15	8.70%
Some college	66	38.40%
Undergraduate college degree	78	45.30%
Graduate degree or above	13	7.60%
<i>Relationship to the new couple</i>		
Bride/Groom	42	24.40%
The new couple's parents	84	48.80%
Other family members of the new couple	23	13.40%
Colleagues of the new couple	8	4.70%
Friends of the new couple	15	8.70%
<i>Personal monthly income</i>		
¥5,000 or less (\$813 or less)	89	51.70%

Table 4.1(Continued)

Variables	Number	Percentage
¥5,001-¥10,000 (\$814-\$1,626)	72	41.90%
¥10,001-¥15,000 (\$1,627-\$2,439)	11	6.40%
¥15,001-¥20,000 (\$2,440-\$3,252)	0	0
¥20,001-¥25,000 (\$3,253-\$4,065)	0	0
¥25,001 or more (\$4,066 or more)	0	0
<i>Wedding banquet budget</i>		
¥50,000 or less (\$8,130 or less)	26	15.10%
¥50,001-¥100,000 (\$8,131-\$16,260)	137	79.70%
¥100,001-¥150,000 (\$16,261-\$24,390)	9	5.20%
¥150,001-¥200,000 (\$24,391-\$32,520)	0	0
¥200,001 or more (\$32,521 or more)	0	0
<i>Acceptable menu price table (excluding beverage costs)</i>		
¥1,500 or less (\$244 or less)	28	16.30%
¥1,501-¥2,500 (\$245-\$406)	139	80.80%
¥2,501-¥3,500 (\$407-\$569)	5	2.90%
¥3,501-¥4,500 (\$570-\$731)	0	0
¥4,501-¥5,500 (\$732-\$894)	0	0
¥5,501 or more (\$895 or more)	0	0

making process for wedding banquets in the Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd.

Cases were excluded listwise in order to manage missing data, and all 172 responses were subsequently deemed usable for the analysis.

The majority (51.7%, $n=89$) of the survey respondents were male, while 48.3% ($n=83$) were female. The largest percentage of decision makers (54.1%, $n=93$) were between 46 and 55 years of age, whereas 5.2% ($n=9$) were 36–45 years of age and 1.7 %

($n=3$) were 56-65 years of age. The second largest percentage of decision makers were between 18-25 years of age (18.6%, $n=32$) and 26-30 years old (18.6%, $n=32$). None of decision makers were older than 65 years of age.

Greater than two in five decision makers (45.3%, $n=78$) had attained a bachelor's degree, while 66 (38.4%) decision makers reported that their highest level of education was some college, 8.7% ($n=15$) indicated that a high school diploma was their highest level of education, and 13 (7.6%) decision makers reported that their highest level of education was a graduate degree or above.

The majority (48.8%, $n=84$) of the decision makers reported that they were parents of the new couple, whereas 4.7% ($n=8$) indicated that they were colleagues of the new couple, 24.4 % ($n=42$) were brides or grooms, 13.4% ($n=23$) were other family members of the new couple, and 8.7% ($n=15$) were friends of the new couple.

For just over half (51.7%, $n=89$) of the decision makers, their personal monthly income was no greater than ¥5,000 (\$813), while 41.9% ($n=72$) indicated that their personal monthly income was between ¥5,001 and ¥10,000 (\$814-\$1,626), and 6.4% ($n=11$) reported a monthly income between ¥10,001 and ¥15,000 (\$1,627-\$2,439). None of the decision makers reported a personal monthly income of greater than ¥15,001 (\$2,440) in this study.

The majority (79.7%, $n=137$) of decision makers reported that their wedding banquet budget was between ¥50,001 and ¥100,000 (\$8,131-\$16,260), while 15.1% ($n=26$) indicated that their wedding banquet budget was no more than ¥50,000 (\$8,130), and 5.20% ($n=9$) reported that their budget was between ¥100,001 and ¥150,000 (\$16,261-\$24,390). None of wedding banquet budgets of the decision makers were

greater than ¥150,001 (\$24,391).

The majority (80.8%, $n=139$) of the decision makers indicated that their acceptable menu price per table (excluding beverage costs) was between ¥1,501 and ¥2,500 (\$245-\$406), while 16.3% ($n=28$) responded that their acceptable menu price per table excluding beverages was no more than ¥1,500 (\$244), and 2.9% ($n=5$) reported that their acceptable menu price per table excluding beverages was between ¥2,501 and ¥3,500 (\$407-\$569). None of decision maker's acceptable menu price per table (excluding beverage costs) was greater than ¥3,501 (\$570).

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was conducted to establish the constructs surrounding engagement by using SPSS 19.0. Based on a review of the literature, 17 pull items and 13 push items were analyzed in order to delineate the underlying dimensions. In accordance with Karser's (1974) criterion, only factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 were retained. Items with loadings greater than .50 were accepted as adequate elements of the construct (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010). The reliability of the push and pull constructs was analyzed using reliability analysis that identifies constructs that produce a Cronbach's alpha greater or equal to .70 as acceptable (Mertler & Vannatta, 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Urdan, 2010). The communalities are computed by taking the sum of the squared loadings for that variable. Items with low communalities (e.g., less than .40) are not highly correlated with one or more of the factors in the solution (Worthington & Whittaker, 2006).

In order to examine the dimensions underlying the push and pull factor scales,

principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation was undertaken. As mentioned above, items with loadings greater than .50 were accepted as adequate elements of the construct.

Push Factors

Among the 13 push items, three items (“to choose the location that will match my desired image of a wedding reception”, “to relax physically” and “to choose the reception location that will fit my needs and personality”) with loadings of less than .50 (-.815, .379, and .461, respectively) were not retained. As such, these three items were not useful to describe any of the four components. The results of the exploratory factor analysis for the push factors are displayed in Table 4.2. Four push factors were derived from the factor analysis of the 10 retained items. The variables were analyzed using scores from a 7-point Likert-style scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Seeking Relaxation and Knowledge. The first push factor produced an eigenvalue of 2.313, explaining 23.132% of the variance. The items in the construct reflected the physical and psychological rewards and wedding celebration expectations that the decision makers sought out in personal dimensions when choosing wedding banquet venues. The means of these four variables in the construct ranged from 4.47 to 5.92. All items of the construct produced loadings greater than .60: “to relax spiritually” (.778), “to experience a different wedding celebration tradition” (.755), “to be away from home” (.745), and “indulging in luxury” (.617). The reliability analysis revealed that the Seeking Relaxation and Knowledge construct produced an acceptable alpha reliability

Table 4.2
Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation for push factors

Push factors	Factor loadings				Communalities	Item means
	1	2	3	4		
<i>Seeking relaxation and knowledge</i>						
To relax spiritually	.778				.620	4.85
To experience a different wedding celebration tradition	.755				.626	5.92
To be away from home	.745				.616	4.47
Indulging in luxury	.617				.526	5.47
Grand mean						5.176
<i>Escaping from daily routine</i>						
To visit a restaurant that I have not been to before		.920			.847	3.87
To satisfy the desire to be somewhere else		.889			.798	4.74
Grand mean						4.305
<i>Fulfilling prestige</i>						
To increase my social status			.889		.810	5.30
To celebrate a wedding in a place that would impress friends and family			.879		.791	5.80
Grand mean						5.549
<i>Social networking</i>						
To visit a place that my friends also visit				.867	.769	3.72
To enhance communication with relatives and friends				.864	.748	4.27
Grand mean						3.994
Eigenvalue	2.313	1.794	1.541	1.502		
Variance explained%	23.132	17.938	15.405	15.02		
Reliability alpha	.706	.807	.739	.722		

Note: Variables scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 5 = Slightly agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree

coefficient (Cronbach's alpha = .706).

Escaping From Daily Routine. The second push factor produced an eigenvalue of 1.794 and explained 17.938% of the variance. The variables in the construct reflected the motivations that drove decision makers to choose specific wedding banquet venues that differed from restaurants and hotels that they usually chose in daily life. The means of these two variables in the construct were 3.87 and 4.74, respectively. Moreover, two variables of the construct produced loadings greater than .80: "to visit a restaurant that I have not been to before" (.920) and "to satisfy the desire to be somewhere else" (.889). The reliability analysis revealed that the Escaping From Daily Routine construct produced an alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha = .807) that is considered to be good.

Fulfilling Prestige. The third push factor produced an eigenvalue of 1.541 and explained 15.405% of the variance. The variables in the construct reflected the importance of the symbolism of an elite lifestyle that decision makers considered when choosing a wedding banquet venue. The means of the variables were 5.30 and 5.80 respectively. All of the variables in the construct produced loadings greater than .80: "to increase my social status" (.889) and "to celebrate a wedding in a place that would impress friends and family" (.879). The reliability analysis revealed that the Fulfilling Prestige construct produced an acceptable alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha = .739).

Social Networking. The last push factor produced an eigenvalue of 1.502 and explained 15.020% of the variance. The variables in the construct reflected the decision makers' feelings about social networking during the decision-making process. The means

of variables in the construct were 3.72 and 4.27 respectively. All of the variables in the construct produced loadings greater than .80: “to visit a place that my friends also visit” (.867) and “to enhance communication with relatives and friends” (.864). The reliability analysis revealed that the Social Networking construct produced an acceptable alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .722$).

In summary, among the four push factors, the third push factor (“fulfilling prestige”) had the highest mean score (5.549), followed by “seeking relaxation and knowledge” (5.176), “escaping from daily routine” (4.305) and “social networking” (3.994). Communalities for all of push factor items are greater than .40.

Pull Factors

Among the 17 push items, only one item: “menu variety”, with a loading of (-.119), was not retained due to its loading of less than .50. As such, this item was not useful to describe any of the components. Six pull factors were derived from the factor analysis of the 16 retained items. The results of the exploratory factor analysis for pull factors are displayed in Table 4.3. The variables were also analyzed using scores from a 7-point Likert-style scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

Budget. The first pull factor produced an eigenvalue of 2.786 and explained 17.414% of the variance. The variables in the construct reflected the decision makers’ considerations about the wedding banquet expenses. The means of variables in the construct ranged from 5.19 to 5.41. All variables in the construct produced loadings greater than .70: “food price” (.884), “beverage price” (.882), and “equipment expense” (.716). The reliability analysis revealed that the Budget construct produced an acceptable

Table 4.3
Principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation for pull factors

Pull factors	Factor loadings						Communalities	Item means
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
<i>Budget</i>								
Food price	.884						.807	5.41
Beverage price	.882						.785	5.30
Equipment expense	.716						.558	5.19
Grand mean								5.300
<i>Atmosphere</i>								
Availability		.795					.686	5.83
Audio equipment		.771					.631	5.69
Decoration		.769					.611	5.88
Grand mean								5.800
<i>Wedding services</i>								
Photography service			.861				.757	2.97
Bridal room facilities			.865				.756	3.28
Bridal limousine service			.654				.484	4.05
Grand mean								3.432
<i>Service and quality</i>								
Cleanliness				.881			.788	5.46
Employee attitude				.791			.635	5.03
Food quality				.642			.622	5.71
Grand mean								5.401
<i>Transportation</i>								
Location of venue					.887		.801	5.14
Parking space					.869		.771	5.51
Grand mean								5.323
<i>Facilities</i>								
Lighting/ambiance						.872	.794	5.41
Size of venue						.864	.781	5.80

Table 4.3(Continued)

Pull factors	Factor loadings						Communalities	Item means
	1	2	3	4	5	6		
Grand mean								5.605
Eigenvalue	2.786	2.158	1.924	1.633	1.419	1.347		
Variance explained%	17.414	13.487	12.024	10.205	8.869	8.416		
Reliability alpha	.775	.705	.713	.716	.729	.718		

Note: Variables scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 5 = Slightly agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree

alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha =.775).

Atmosphere. The second pull factor produced an eigenvalue of 2.158 while explaining 13.487% of the variance. The variables in the construct reflected the decision makers' feelings on tangible and intangible aspects of banquet venues. The means of variables in the construct ranged from 5.69 to 5.88. All variables in the construct produced loadings greater than .70: "availability" (.795), "audio equipment" (.771), and "decoration" (.769). The reliability analysis revealed that the Atmosphere construct produced an acceptable alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha =.705).

Wedding Services. The third pull factor produced an eigenvalue of 1.924 and explained 12.024% of the variance. The variables in the construct reflected the decision makers' considerations regarding the wedding services provided by wedding banquet venues. The means of variables in the construct ranged from 2.97 to 4.05. All variables in the construct produced loadings greater than .60: "photography service" (.861), "bridal room facilities" (.865), and "bridal limousine service" (.716). The reliability analysis revealed that the Wedding services construct produced an acceptable alpha reliability

coefficient (Cronbach's alpha =.713).

Service and Quality. The fourth pull factor produced an eigenvalue of 1.633 and explained 10.205% of the variance. The variables in the construct reflected the attractive attributes of wedding banquet venues that decision makers focused on. The means of variables in the construct ranged from 5.03 to 5.71. All variables in the construct produced loadings greater than .60: "cleanliness" (.881), "employee attitude" (.791), and "food quality" (.642). The reliability analysis revealed that the Service and Quality construct produced an acceptable alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha =.716).

Transportation. The fifth pull factor produced an eigenvalue of 1.419 while explaining 8.869% of the variance. The variables in the construct reflected the significance of convenience in the venue choices considered by the decision makers. The means of the variables in the construct were 5.14 and 5.51 respectively. All variables in the construct produced loadings greater than .80: "location of venue" (.887) and "parking space" (.869). The reliability analysis revealed that the Transportation construct produced an acceptable alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha =.729).

Facilities. The final pull factor produced an eigenvalue of 1.347 and explained 8.416% of the variance. The variables in the construct reflected the decision makers' considerations about wedding banquet venue facilities. The means of the variables in the construct were 5.41 and 5.80 respectively. All variables in the construct produced loadings greater than .80: "lighting/ambiance" (.872) and "size of venue" (.864). The reliability analysis revealed that the Facilities construct produced an acceptable alpha reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha =.718).

In summary, among the six pull factors, the second pull factor ("atmosphere") had

the highest mean score (5.800), followed by “facilities” (5.605), “service and quality” (5.401), “transportation” (5.323), “budget” (5.300), and “wedding services” (3.432).

Communalities for all of push factor items are greater than .40.

ANOVA Results

To compare the differences between push and pull factors among three demographic variables (“relationship with the new couple”, “personal monthly income”, and “wedding banquet budget”), one-way ANOVA was employed.

Comparison of Push and Pull Factors for Different Relationship Groups

The first ANOVA analysis conducted to examine differences in the importance of the push and pull factors for the five different relationship groups of the new couple (Group 1: bride/groom; Group 2: the new couple’s parents; Group 3: other family members of the new couple; Group 4: friends of the new couple; and Group 5: colleagues of the new couple).

The results of this analysis are shown in Table 4.4. Based on the results, significant differences were observed for the relationship groups regarding only one pull factor, “budget” ($p < .05$), Group 4 showed the highest mean score (5.444), indicating that friends of the new couple tended to perceive the budget factor to be more important than did the other four groups. Other significant differences among the relationship groups were not noted.

Table 4.4
ANOVA for comparison of push and pull factors by relationship group

Push and pull factors		Group 1 (n=42)	Group 2 (n=84)	Group 3 (n=23)	Group 4 (n=15)	Group 5 (n=8)	ANOVA
<i>Push factors</i>							
Seeking relaxation and knowledge	Mean	5.101	5.205	5.174	5.183	5.250	$F=.585$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$P=.674$
Fulfilling prestige	Mean	5.488	5.637	5.326	5.567	5.563	$F=1.447$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$P=.221$
Escaping from daily routine	Mean	4.405	4.256	4.239	4.267	4.563	$F=.562$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$P=.690$
Social networking	Mean	3.988	4.071	3.891	3.800	3.875	$F=.959$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$P=.432$
<i>Pull factors</i>							
Budget	Mean	5.421	5.206	5.377	5.444	5.167	$F=2.479$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$P=.046$
Atmosphere	Mean	5.849	5.818	5.739	5.778	5.583	$F=1.056$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$P=.380$
Facilities	Mean	5.655	5.643	5.435	5.700	5.250	$F=1.905$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$P=.112$
Wedding services	Mean	3.429	3.429	3.464	3.400	3.458	$F=.047$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$P=.996$
Transportation	Mean	5.464	5.316	5.217	5.233	5.125	$P=1.236$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$F=.298$
Service and quality	Mean	4.667	4.563	4.522	4.667	4.542	$P=.950$
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	$F=.436$

Note: Variables scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 5 = Slightly agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree. Group1: bride/groom, Group 2: the new couple's parents, Group 3: other family members of the new couple, Group 4: friends of the new couple, Group 5: colleagues of the new couple.

Comparison of Push and Pull Factors for Different Personal Monthly Income Groups

The second ANOVA analysis involved an examination of the push and pull factors across the three personal monthly income groups including Group1: ¥5000 or less (\$813 or less); Group 2: ¥5,001- ¥10,000 (\$814-\$1,626); and Group 3: ¥10,000-¥15,000 (\$1,627-\$2,439).

The results of this analysis are provided in Table 4.5, which shows that there was no significant difference observed among push and pull factors, since all *p*-values of each factor were greater than .050.

Table 4.5
ANOVA for comparison of push and pull factors by personal monthly income group

Push and pull factors		Group 1 (n=89)	Group 2 (n=72)	Group 3 (n=11)	ANOVA
<i>Push factors</i>					
Seeking relaxation and knowledge	Mean	5.185	5.184	5.046	<i>F</i> =.668
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>P</i> =.514
Fulfilling prestige	Mean	5.506	5.590	5.636	<i>F</i> =.545
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>P</i> =.581
Escaping from daily routine	Mean	4.287	4.271	4.682	<i>F</i> =1.506
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>P</i> =.225
Social networking	Mean	3.893	4.111	4.046	<i>F</i> =2.635
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>P</i> =.075
<i>Pull factors</i>					
Budget	Mean	5.292	5.264	5.606	<i>F</i> =2.853
	Difference	N/A	(3)	(2)	<i>P</i> =.060
Atmosphere	Mean	5.802	5.796	5.818	<i>F</i> =.017
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	<i>P</i> =.983

Table 4.5 (Continued)

Push and pull factors		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	ANOVA
		(n=89)	(n=72)	(n=11)	
Facilities	Mean	5.669	5.563	5.364	F=2.100
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.126
Wedding services	Mean	3.405	3.454	3.515	F=.368
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.693
Transportation	Mean	5.292	5.382	5.182	F=.887
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.414
Service and quality	Mean	4.607	4.583	4.515	F=.325
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.723

Note: Variables scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly

disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 5 = Slightly agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree. Group1: ¥5000

or less (\$813 or less), Group 2: ¥5,001- ¥10,000 (\$814-\$1,626), Group 3: ¥10,000-¥15,000 (\$1,627-\$2,439).

Comparison of Push and Pull Factors for Different Wedding Banquet Budget Groups

The final ANOVA procedure revealed a significant effect based on the examination of the push and pull factors across the three wedding banquet budget groups including Group 1: ¥50,000 or less (\$8,130 or less); Group 2: ¥50,001- ¥10,000 (\$8,131-\$16,260); and Group 3: ¥100,000-¥150,000 (\$16,261-\$24,390). The results of the analysis conducted to explore this effect are shown in Table 4.6.

For the push factor “social networking” ($p=.030$), Group 1 showed the highest mean score (4.115), indicating that the decision maker whose wedding banquet budget was ¥50,000 or less (\$8,130 or less) tended to perceive social networking as more

important than did the other groups of decision makers. Other differences were not significantly recorded since their *p*-values were greater than .050.

Table 4.6
ANOVA for comparison of push and pull factors by wedding banquet budget group

Push and pull factors		Group 1 (n=26)	Group 2 (n=137)	Group 3 (n=9)	ANOVA
<i>Push factors</i>					
Seeking relaxation and knowledge	Mean	5.212	5.175	5.083	F=.367
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.693
Fulfilling prestige	Mean	5.635	5.544	5.389	F=.620
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.539
Escaping from daily routine	Mean	4.404	4.263	4.667	F=1.505
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.225
Social networking	Mean	4.115	4.004	3.500	F=3.597
	Difference	(3)	(3)	(1,2)	P=.030
<i>Pull factors</i>					
Budget	Mean	5.397	5.273	5.444	F=1.335
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.266
Atmosphere	Mean	5.769	5.813	5.704	F=.457
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.634
Facilities	Mean	5.789	5.577	5.500	F=2.013
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.137
Wedding services	Mean	3.539	3.411	3.444	F=.741
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.478
Transportation	Mean	5.289	5.307	5.667	F=1.830
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.164
Service and quality	Mean	4.628	4.596	4.407	F=1.259
	Difference	N/A	N/A	N/A	P=.286

Note: Variables scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Slightly disagree, 4 = Neither agree nor disagree, 5 = Slightly agree, 6 = Agree, 7 = Strongly agree. Group1: ¥50,000 or less (\$8,130 or less), Group 2: ¥50,001- ¥10,000 (\$8,131-\$16,260), Group 3: ¥100,000- ¥150,000 (\$ 16,261-\$24,390).

Pearson Bivariate Correlation Analysis

The direction and magnitude of the correlation determines whether the values of one variable are associated with the values of a second variable (Urdan, 2010). For instance, if a correlation between two variables is positive, it is assumed that as one variable increases or decreases, the other variable increases or decreases accordingly. In contrast, a negative correlation indicates that as one variable increases or decreases, the other variable decreases or increases accordingly. The magnitude of correlation ranges from -1 to 1. A correlation coefficient between $-.20$ and $.20$ indicates a weak relationship between variables, while a coefficient between $-.20$ and $-.50$ or $.20$ and $.50$ reveals a moderate relationship. A coefficient between $-.50$ and $-.70$ or $.50$ and $.70$ indicates a strong relationship (Urdan, 2010; Aron et al., 2005).

Table 4.7
Correlation analysis of push and pull factors

Push factors	Pull factors					Service and quality
	Budget	Atmosphere	Facilities	Wedding services	Transportation	
Seeking relaxation and knowledge	-.146	.028	-.085	.116	.084	-.002
Fulfilling prestige	.030	-.008	.084	.014	-.058	.103
Escaping from daily routine	-.042	.013	.045	-.072	-.129	.073
Social networking	.024	-.005	-.021	-.018	-.085	.089

Note: None of Correlations are qualified to be marked with an asterisk (*) as significant values at $p < .050$.

Table 4.7 shows the results of the Pearson bivariate correlation analysis conducted to examine the relationships among the push and pull factors identified in this research. Only correlation coefficient (with a minimum $-.20 \leq r \leq .20$) found among these push and pull factors at the $p < .050$ level was considered as reasonable proof to demonstrate the existence of relationships among them. Since none of the coefficients shown in Table 4.7 met the minimum requirement, it was concluded that no correlation between the push and pull factors was significant in this study.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Overview

This chapter concludes the results of the analyses conducted using the data that were obtained in a survey of consumers at the Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. It also provides implications, limitations, and recommendations for future study. A review of the literature surrounding push and pull factors in determining consumers' motivations for choosing wedding banquet venues led to the development of the four research questions that guided this study:

- What are the influencing push factors for decision makers when they choose wedding banquet venues?
- What are the influencing pull factors for decision makers when they choose wedding banquet venues?
- Are there any differences in the push and pull factors across demographic variables including “relationship with the new couple”, “personal monthly income”, and “wedding banquet budget”?
- Are there any relationships among the push and pull factors in the study?

Conclusion

This section provides a conclusion of the results of the descriptive analysis, exploratory factor analysis, ANOVA analysis, and correlation analysis. The data were

quantitatively analyzed using SPSS 19.0.

Descriptive Analysis

According to the results of the descriptive analysis, the present author found that the majority (51.70%, $n=89$) of survey respondents were male, while 48.30% ($n=83$) were female. The largest percentage of decision makers (54.10%, $n=93$) were between 46 and 55 years of age. None of decision makers were 65 years old or older. Just less than half (48.8%, $n=84$) of the decision makers reported that they were parents of the new couple, while 24.40% ($n=42$) of the decision makers indicated that they were brides or grooms. These results indicate that older respondents were the significant parties participating in the decision-making processes and that the majority were parents of the couples. Moreover, for more than two in five decision makers (45.30%, $n=78$), their highest education level was a bachelor's degree, while 66 (38.40%) decision makers reported that their highest level of education was some college. Only 13 (7.60%) decision makers reported that their highest level of education was a graduate degree or above. The researcher suggests that the Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd was attractive to decision makers who had obtained higher education. For just over half (51.70%, $n=89$) of the decision makers, their personal monthly income was no more than ¥5,000 (\$813), while 41.90% ($n=72$) indicated that their personal monthly income was between ¥5,001 and ¥10,000 (\$814-\$1,626). However, the majority (79.70%, $n=137$) of the decision makers reported that their wedding banquet budget was between ¥50,001 and ¥100,000 (\$8,131-\$16,260). The results revealed that most decision makers were willing to spend nearly the amount of their annual income on a wedding banquet, demonstrating that they

perceived wedding banquets as a very important event worth considerable expenditure. Furthermore, the vast majority (80.80%, $n=139$) of the decision makers indicated that their acceptable menu price per table (excluding beverage costs) was between ¥1,501 and ¥2,500 (\$245-\$406). In China, menu price per table offered by restaurants and hotels doesn't include beverage costs because of Chinese wine drinking culture. Drinking wine has become a sign of culture and of wealth. Customers may have some specular options to choose wine based on their budget. For this case, this kind of menu price is considered as a convenient way for consumers to make decisions when they concern about the total amount of money paid for the banquet. The researcher suggests that, based on their indicated budgets, the acceptable menu price per table of decision makers was correlated with the number of tables that they planned to reserve. Generally, the number of tables needed in a wedding banquet ranges from 15 to 20 in China, ensuring that all of the friends and relatives of the new couple can be served in the venue. Therefore, it is imperative to appropriately price a menu per table to attract guests.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

The results of exploratory analysis revealed that the extracted 10 push items resulted in four underlying push factors: “seeking relaxation and knowledge”, “fulfilling prestige”, “escaping from daily routine”, and “social networking”. The most important push factors were “fulfilling prestige”, which had the highest mean score (5.549); followed by “seeking relaxation and knowledge” (5.176); “escaping from daily routine” (4.305); and “social networking” (3.994). The results suggest that decision makers in China are more likely to consider wedding banquet venues as valuable resources that

provide important opportunities to fulfill prestige.

The exploratory factor analysis also revealed that the extracted 16 pull items resulted in six underlying pull factors: “budget”, “atmosphere”, “facilities”, “wedding services”, “transportation”, and “service and quality”. Decision makers highly rated “atmosphere” (5.800), followed by “facilities” (5.605), “service and quality” (5.401), “transportation” (5.323), and “budget” (5.300). The least important pull factor was “wedding services” which had the lowest mean score (3.432). This finding reflects the fact that the decision makers are likely to be more concerned about the atmosphere and facilities of venues than the wedding services provided by the venues.

ANOVA and Correlation Analysis

The ANOVA analysis examined the differences in these push and pull factors across three different demographic variables: “relationship with the new couple”, “personal monthly income”, and “wedding banquet budget”.

The first significant difference for the different groups was found across the variable “relationship with the new couple” on one pull factor, “budget” ($p < .050$). This finding indicated that Group 4 showed the highest mean score (5.444), which means that the friends of the new couple tended to perceive the “budget” pull factor to be more important compared to the other four groups. Other differences were not significantly recorded.

The last significant difference for the different groups was observed across the variable “wedding banquet budget” on one pull factor, “social networking” ($p = .030$). This finding indicated that the decision maker whose wedding banquet budget was no

more than ¥50,000 (\$8,130) tended to perceive social networking to be more important than did the other groups of decision makers. Other differences were not significantly recorded, because their p -values were greater than .050.

Finally, the researcher failed to find a significant relationship among these push and pull factors at the $p < .050$ level. This suggested that decision makers are willing to consider independently about push and pull factors when choosing wedding banquet venues.

Implications

The decision makers in this study rated the push factor, “fulfilling prestige” as the most important push factor with the highest mean score, which is consistent with the results of a theme park study conducted by Mohammad and Som (2010). Moreover, the most important pull factor was determined to be “atmosphere”, which refers to decoration, audio equipment, and availability of the venue in wedding banquet venue research. The culture of China emphasizes status and food. Thus, wedding banquet industry marketers in China should be aware that potential consumers are motivated to patronize wedding banquet venues such as restaurants and hotels based on their demand for a prestigious and elite atmosphere. As such, managers and marketers should strive to provide superlative ambiance and service in their venues.

With regard to push factors, the findings about “escaping from daily routine” and “social networking” are consistent with the results of previous tourism studies about travel destinations (e.g., Iso-Ahola, 1982 & 1989; Dann, 1981). Wedding venue industry practitioners should seek to create distinct experiences for consumers and offer exceptionally unique venues. Moreover, as mentioned above, the decision maker whose

wedding banquet budget was ¥50,000 or less (\$8,130 or less) tended to perceive social networking as more important than did the other groups of decision makers. Marketers in the wedding banquet industry are therefore advised to develop appealing facilities with appropriately priced menus for consumers that perceive wedding banquets as opportunities to enhance social connection and communication between guests. A new push factor, “seeking relaxation and knowledge” was identified in this study. Industry practitioners in wedding banquets in China are expected to satisfy consumers’ demands for spiritual relaxation and knowledge in wedding celebration tradition such as the difference of etiquette between western reception and traditional Chinese reception.

The pull factor “wedding services” was identified as having the lowest mean score among pull factors. In China, consumers generally are willing to employ wedding service agencies, which offer a wide range of well-organized wedding services including dating services, wedding planning, wedding car rentals, dress rentals, video recording services, wedding photography services, wedding banquets, and masters of ceremonies. Thus, wedding banquet industry practitioners should decrease the costs associated with providing wedding services in restaurants or hotels to make their services more appealing to decision makers, or cooperate with professional wedding service agencies to develop mutually beneficial collaborations that offer good value to customers and encourage the purchase of wedding services when selecting a banquet venue.

The new pull factor “service and quality” was identified as having the third mean score among six pull factors. This factor refers to cleanliness, employee attitude, and food quality. Previous researchers have underscored the significance of these three attributes as implicit and explicit signals delivered to consumers (Liu and Jang, 2009; Chu & Choi,

2000). Thus, it is advised that industry practitioners strive to improve the quality of service and food and guarantee exemplary restaurant/hotel staff performance in order to meet or exceed customers' expectations.

The present author's findings on the three pull factors "budget", "transportation", and "facilities" are consistent with previous studies (e.g., Yuan and Mc Donald, 1990; Kim, Lee & Klenosky, 2002; Fakeye and Crompton 1991). As mentioned above, among the decision makers participating in the surveys, friends of the new couple tended to perceive the "budget" pull factor to be more important in comparison to the other four groups. One explanation for this finding is that the friends of the new couple might also be considering marriage and would therefore be budget minded when thinking about the wedding planning process. Therefore, marketers should provide a variety of banquet menu plans that include lower and moderately priced options to meet the needs of this group. In terms of the pull factor "facilities", the selection attributes discussed in previous hotel ballroom and restaurant studies are primarily related to availability, location, atmosphere, and facilities (Lau & Hui, 2010). Since Chinese consumers are generally willing to reserve 15 to 20 tables for wedding banquets, industry practitioners should ensure that their venues are adequately sized to accommodate the number of guests that the wedding hosts wish to invite. With regard to the pull factor "transportation", a previous study conducted by Callan and Hoyes (2000) investigated the requirements that an event organizer should consider when selecting appealing venues in terms of location and parking accommodations. Thus, wedding banquet venue staff should seek to optimize the convenience of location and parking to ensure ease of access and sufficient parking spaces for consumers.

Limitations and Future Study

Although this study offers a unique and valuable contribution by making the first attempt to utilize push-pull theory to investigate customer motivation in choosing wedding banquet venues, it nonetheless poses some limitations to be addressed. First, the population for this research consisted of consumers who participated in the decision-making process for choosing Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. as a wedding banquet venue and who were surveyed from February 8 to February 28, 2014. This narrow study population limits the generalization of the findings of this study. Second, while respondents obtained incentives for their participation, some participants nonetheless may not have reported entirely accurate information on the surveys because of privacy concerns. Third, it should be noted that only 10 of the 13 push items and 16 of the 17 pull items were covered as usable categories of push and pull factors using EFA. Since these categories cannot comprehensively describe all customer motivations for choosing wedding banquet venues, the explanations and implications of the results may be too limited to be generalized.

Future studies should survey a larger number of consumers, and researchers may consider additional push and pull motivation factors to include for analysis. Of particular interest may be psychological factors that drive consumers to make wedding banquet venue decisions. Furthermore, the relationships among push and pull factors in this study were not found to be significant; however, relationships between the factors may exist nonetheless. Future researchers should develop categories of push and pull factors based on this study to examine the relationships between them. Finally, it is also advised that further research be conducted utilizing alternative theories to investigate this topic. Little

research has focused on the wedding banquet industry and, while this study made the first attempts to use push and pull factor theory to analyze customers' motivations in choosing banquet venues, other theories may be also be useful in gaining an understanding of selection attributes in the decision-making process.

REFERENCES

- Adler, H., & Chienm, T. C. (2005). The wedding business: a method to boost food and beverage revenues in hotels. *Journal of foodservice business research*, 7(1), 117-125.
- Aron, A., Aron, E. M., & Coups, E. J. (2005). *Statistics for the behavioral and social sciences: A brief course (3rd ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Auty, S. (1992). Consumer choice and segmentation in the restaurant industry. *Service Industries Journal*, 12(3), 324-339.
- Baloglu, S., & Uysal, M. (1996). Market segments of push and pull motivations: a canonical correlation approach. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 8(3), 32-38.
- Bowdin, G. A. J., McDonnell, I., Allen, J., & O'Toole, W. (2006). *Events Management*. London, England: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Bracken, B. A., & Barona, A. (1991). State of the art procedures for translating, validating and using psycho-educational tests in cross-cultural assessment. *School Psychology International*, 12(1-2), 119-132.
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of cross-cultural psychology*, 1(3), 185-216.
- Bull, A. O. (1994). Pricing a motel's location. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 6(6), 10-15.
- Callan, R. J., & Hoyes, M. K. (2000). A preliminary assessment of the function and conference service product at a UK stately home. *Tourism Management*, 21(6), 571-581.
- Chang, A. M., Chau, J. P., & Holroyd, E. (1999). Translation of questionnaires and issues of equivalence. *Journal of advanced nursing*, 29(2), 316-322.
- Chapman, D. W., & Carter, J. F. (1979). Translation procedures for the cross cultural use of measurement instruments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1(3), 71-76.
- Choi, K. (2002). *Traditional wedding banquet*. Hong Kong: Hai Bin Tu Shu Gong Si.
- Chu, R. K., & Choi, T. (2000). An importance-performance analysis of hotel selection factors in the Hong Kong hotel industry: a comparison of business and leisure travelers. *Tourism management*, 21(4), 363-377.

- Crompton, J. L. (1979). Motivations for pleasure vacation. *Annals of tourism research*, 6(4), 408-424.
- Dann, G. M. S. (1977). Anomie, ego-enhancement and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 4(4), 184-194.
- ESDlife (2007). *80% Respondents choose to Hold Chinese Wedding Banquet China Restaurant Ranks the Most Popular Wedding Banquet Venue*. ESD Services Limited.
- Fakeye, P. C., & Crompton, J. L. (1991). Image differences between prospective, first-time, and repeat visitors to the Lower Rio Grande Valley. *Journal of travel research*, 30(2), 10-16.
- Forsyth, P. (1999). *Maximizing hospitality sales: how to sell hotels, venues and conference centers*. London, England: Cassell.
- HKTb. (2004). *Summary of the Hong Kong hotel industry review 2003*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Tourism Board.
- HKTb. (2005). *Summary of the Hong Kong hotel industry review 2004*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Tourism Board
- HKTb. (2006). *Summary of the Hong Kong hotel industry review 2005*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Tourism Board.
- HKTb. (2007). *Summary of the Hong Kong hotel industry review 2006*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Tourism Board.
- HKTb. (2008). *Summary of the Hong Kong hotel industry review 2007*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Tourism Board.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1982). Toward a social psychological theory of tourism motivation: A rejoinder. *Annals of tourism research*, 9(2), 256-262.
- Iso-Ahola, S. E. (1989). Motivation for leisure. *Understanding leisure and recreation: Mapping the past, charting the future*, 247-279.
- Jang, S., & Cai, L. (2002). Travel motivations and destination choice: A study of British outbound market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 13(3), 111-133.
- Kim, S. S., Lee, C. K., & Klenosky, D. B. (2003). The influence of push and pull factors at Korean national parks. *Tourism Management*, 24(2), 169-180.
- Klenosky, D. B. (2002). The "pull" of tourism destinations: A means-end investigation. *Journal of travel Research*, 40(4), 396-403.

- Lau, C.K.H., & Hui, S. (2010). Selection attributes of wedding banquet venues: an exploratory study of Hong Kong prospective wedding banquet. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(2), 268-276.
- Li, J. (2013, January 23). Chongqing's GDP growth No.2 in China. *The China Daily*. Retrieved from <http://www.chinadaily.com>
- Liu, Y., & Jang, S. S. (2009). The effects of dining atmospherics: an extended Mehrabian–Russell model. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 28(4), 494-503.
- Lockyer, T. (2005). The perceived importance of price as one hotel selection dimension. *Tourism Management*, 26(4), 529-537.
- Luo, S. (2012, April 26). Chongqing's household register population hit 33.2981million in 2011. *The Chongqing News*. Retrieved from <http://www.cqnews.net>
- Madden, N. (2010, December 15). Tying the Knot in China. *Advertising Age*. Retrieved from <http://adage.com/china/article/china-news>
- Marsan, J. (2000). A marriage of convenience. *Hotels*, 34(5), 77-82.
- McDermott, M. A. N., & Palchanes, K. (1994). A literature review of the critical elements in translation theory. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 26(2), 113-118.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2010). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods: Practical application and interpretation (4th ed.)*. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.
- Mohamed, N., & Othman, N. (2012). Push and Pull Factor: Determining the Visitors Satisfactions at Urban Recreational Area. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 49, 175-182.
- Mohammad, B. A. M. A. H., & Som, A. P. M. (2010). An Analysis of Push and Pull Travel Motivations of Foreign Tourists to Jordan. *International Journal of Business & Management*, 5(12).
- Norris, M., & Lecavalier, L. (2010). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in developmental disability psychological research. *Journal of autism and developmental disorders*, 40(1), 8-20.
- Nunnally, J. (1978). *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Perkowski, J. (2012, May 30). Wedding bells, and cash registers, ring in China. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites>

- Post, P. (2006). *Emily Post's wedding etiquette*. New York, USA: HarperCollins
- Ryan, C. (1991). *Recreational tourism: A social science perspective*. Routledge.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics (5th ed.)*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Temple, B. (1997). Watch your tongue: issues in translation and cross-cultural research. *Sociology*, 31(3), 607-618.
- Urdan, T.C. (2010). *Statistics in plain English (3rd ed.)*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Van der Wagen, L., & Carlos, B. R. (2005). *Event management: For tourism, cultural, business, and sporting events*. French Forest, NSW: Pearson Hospitality Press.
- Worthington, R. L., & Whittaker, T. A. (2006). Scale development research a content analysis and recommendations for best practices. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 34(6), 806-838.
- Yuan, S., & McDonald, C. (1990). Motivational determinates of international pleasure time. *Journal of Travel Research*, 29(1), 42–44.

APPENDIX A. HUMAN SUBJECTS FORMS

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Institutional Review Board
Office for Responsible Research
Vice President for Research
1138 Pearson Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-2207
515 294-4566
FAX 515 294-4267

Date: 2/7/2014

To: Ling Guan
819 Lincoln Way, Unit 4
Ames, IA 50010

CC: Dr. Liang Tang
12 MacKay Hall

From: Office for Responsible Research

Title: Push and pull factors in determining the consumers' motivation for choosing wedding banquet venues: A case study in Chongqing, China

IRB ID: 14-021

Study Review Date: 2/6/2014

The project referenced above has been declared exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b) because it meets the following federal requirements for exemption:

- (2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey or interview procedures with adults or observation of public behavior where
 - Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects cannot be identified directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; or
 - Any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could not reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, or reputation.

The determination of exemption means that:

- **You do not need to submit an application for annual continuing review.**
- **You must carry out the research as described in the IRB application.** Review by IRB staff is required prior to implementing modifications that may change the exempt status of the research. In general, review is required for any modifications to the research procedures (e.g., method of data collection, nature or scope of information to be collected, changes in confidentiality measures, etc.), modifications that result in the inclusion of participants from vulnerable populations, and/or any change that may increase the risk or discomfort to participants. Changes to key personnel must also be approved. The purpose of review is to determine if the project still meets the federal criteria for exemption.

Non-exempt research is subject to many regulatory requirements that must be addressed prior to implementation of the study. Conducting non-exempt research without IRB review and approval may constitute non-compliance with federal regulations and/or academic misconduct according to ISU policy.

Detailed information about requirements for submission of modifications can be found on the Exempt Study Modification Form. A Personnel Change Form may be submitted when the only modification involves changes in study staff. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an Application for Approval of Research Involving Humans Form will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.

Please note that you must submit all research involving human participants for review. **Only the IRB or designees may make the determination of exemption**, even if you conduct a study in the future that is exactly like this study.

Please be aware that **approval from other entities may also be needed.** For example, access to data from private records (e.g. student, medical, or employment records, etc.) that are protected by FERPA, HIPAA, or other confidentiality policies requires permission from the holders of those records. Similarly, for research conducted in institutions other than ISU (e.g., schools, other colleges or universities, medical facilities, companies, etc.), investigators must obtain permission from the institution(s) as required by their policies. **An IRB determination of exemption in no way implies or guarantees that**

permission from these other entities will be granted.

Please don't hesitate to contact us if you have questions or concerns at 515-294-4566 or IRB@iastate.edu.

APPENDIX B. COPY OF TRAINING STATEMENT

TRAINING STATEMENT

Dear IRB of Iowa State University,

In the position of the general manager, manager's secretary, and banquet executive of Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd respectively, we are glad to help Ling Guan, master student of Iowa State University, with data collection as Key Personnel for her study entitled "Push and Pull Factors in Determining the Consumers' motivation for choosing Wedding Banquet Venues: A case study in Chongqing, China". We have carefully read Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health's "Field Training Guides for Data Collectors" in Chinese version. Each one agrees to receive information as applicable in a manner consistent with the following provisions:

JHSPH HUMAN SUBJECTS RESEARCH ETHICS FIELD TRAINING GUIDE

This guide is intended to be used as a tool for training individuals who will be "engaged" in some aspect of a human subject research interaction or intervention. It is directed, in particular, to Johns Hopkins principal investigators who are responsible for training of study team members who will (1) obtain informed consent from research participants, or (2) collect data from human participants through individual or focus group interviews, testing, physical measurements, or other procedures involving direct contact, hereafter called a "data collector". The content and language level of this guide is specifically worded to help the investigator convey basic research principles and behavior that accords with those principles to data collectors. We encourage users who translate the document into local languages to submit those translations (with certifications of the translator's qualifications) to our office (irboffice@jhsphe.edu) so we can make them available to other investigators.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Ethical Interaction with Human Participants
 - a. Role of the Data Collector
 - b. Importance of Respect
 - c. Voluntary Participation
 - d. Informed Consent
 - e. Vulnerable Populations
 - f. Personal Privacy
 - g. Protection of Personal Information
 - h. Response to Participant Questions

2. Data Integrity

- a. Respect for the Science of the Study
- b. Collecting, Recording, and Storing Study Data
- c. Deviations from Study Procedures

1. *Ethical Interaction with Human Participants*

a. Role of the Data Collector

The person who collects information on behalf of a research team is an “ambassador” for the study. The data collector is sometimes the only person on the study team with whom a research participant will come into contact.

People who come into contact with that person will have a good impression of the study or a bad impression of the study, depending on how the data collector presents him- or herself.

The data collector has the responsibility for making sure that the information collected for the study comes from individuals who understand what they are agreeing to do. In addition, the data collector must ensure that the information collected and recorded is accurate and protected from loss. Otherwise, the study objectives will not be achieved. To be successful, the data collector must carefully follow the research plan, study operations manual and other procedures involving contact with human participants.

b. Respect

Each person who is part of the research team must show respect for:

- the goals of the research project,
- the leaders of the project,
- the individual study participant,
- the participant community and
- the data collected that will help achieve project objectives.

The scientific project has the potential to benefit the community that will be studied, but only if the research team is able to complete all the parts of the study.

Each individual research team member must conduct all interactions with members of the participant community with respect. This includes respecting the participant community’s culture, gender, age, social status, religion and other characteristics that make people different from each other, as well as their right to ask questions. The individual does not have to help the research team by participating in the study, and they will not do so if the research team is not respectful of the participant’s right to say “yes” or “no”, or to receive honest and true information from all team members

The data collector conveys to each participant the importance of the study purpose by collecting data in a professional and respectful manner. For example:

- Always be polite to the participant whether or not she or he agrees to participate in the study.
- If the data collector is asking questions, ask them in a clear voice.

- Record the information neatly on the data collection sheets.
- If the participant asks a question, provide an answer that is correct. If you do not know the answer, and it is possible for you to obtain the information from your supervisor, tell the participant that you will obtain an answer to their question and that you will let them know what you find out.
- Thank the participants once they have completed the study procedures.

c. Voluntary Participation

No individual person is required to participate in a research project. If the study includes an informed consent process, then each person approached by a study team member has the right to refuse to hear about the study, and the right to refuse to join the study. Even if a person joins the study, he or she may refuse to answer specific questions in a survey or questionnaire, refuse to give a specimen or refuse to take a test, and may decide to withdraw from a study at any time.

The research team member who obtains informed consent from participants is responsible for ensuring that the individual understands what the study is about and truly agrees to join the study and is not joining because they are afraid not to, or feel forced to join.

d. Informed Consent

Providing correct, factual information to persons being approached to join a study is an essential part of human subjects research. Informed consent is an ongoing process that begins with the research team member explaining the study to the participant. Informed consent does not end with the participant signing the consent form and agreeing to be in the study. The process of informed consent continues throughout the study; for example, it can occur each time a data collector and participant interact. There is no true "consent" to join a study if a person does not adequately understand what is being asked of them. The investigative team determines ahead of time what is "adequate" and how that information should be conveyed. The job of the person conducting informed consent is to present information about the study to the potential participant in language that s/he can understand, and in a way that reveals the study purpose, procedures, potential risks and benefits of the study. The language and style of communication should enable a participant to understand. That discussion should give the participant enough time to ask questions and to think about the decision whether or not to join the study.

Sometimes it is important to check in with the participant from time to time to make sure that the participant continues to understand what the study is about, or what it involves. The study team member who is obtaining consent may have to ask the participant questions to see what the participant has learned, and whether the participant has the correct understanding. The research team member should also be aware of the participant's body language, as the participant may look physically uncomfortable or confused, but not say so. If these responses are observed, the study team member should notify his/her supervisor for further guidance.

e. Vulnerable Populations

Some people need extra attention and care when approached to participate in a research project because they have conditions that make it difficult for them to understand what is being told to them and to provide informed consent. For example, children need extra "protection" and it is important that their parents make certain

decisions for them. Adults who have dementia may not understand what you are asking them to do. The research plan and the operations manual, developed by the investigators, should tell you how to approach these individuals, and if they are to be included in the study. Research team members must be very careful to follow the rules when enrolling vulnerable populations because most of the time they cannot make decisions for themselves. If the study will include people who cannot make decisions for themselves, an authorized caregiver or other proper representative must be available to decide for them.

f. Personal Privacy

Individuals have a right to privacy that the research team must understand and respect. Even if the culture does not promote or generally give recognition to the concept of "privacy", it is important that the right to privacy be protected to every possible extent. For example, it may be the custom that no one enters another person's home without being invited. The study team must honor this custom. Or, the visit of a data collector to a home may attract curious onlookers, whose presence may be undesirable and will distract the data collector and participant from focusing on the important process of data collection. The study team must anticipate this problem and minimize it. When a data collector requests privacy, that action assures the respondent that the data collector respects that the home is where the family lives; it is not a public space.

Research team members must also respect the participant's personal privacy by not causing them any unnecessary personal embarrassment or discomfort. Interviews involving sensitive information should take place where other people cannot hear the questions or responses. Physical examinations should not occur where other people can watch. Also, there are certain things that are considered to be "private", such as sexual activity, personal health, or thoughts that one might not want to talk about in public.

g. Protection of Personal Information

When a study participant discloses personal information about him or herself to a data collector, that participant is at risk of having highly confidential information become "public". That is, s/he risks losing confidentiality. The risk is that if someone outside the study learns about the private information, bad things could happen to the participant, like embarrassment, loss of employment, legal problems, or social damage. The research team is responsible for protecting the participant from this kind of injury.

After a study participant has provided information, that personal information must be kept safe. No one without the proper authority should see or have access to the information. If the information is written on paper, then that paper should be protected until it is locked up in a cabinet. It must only be seen and processed by study staff who are authorized by the study investigators to handle the information. If the information is electronic, then all necessary precautions should be taken to make sure that no unauthorized person can access it.

Sometimes a random study number is used to identify the data so that no one will know which participant the data came from. Any document that links a number with the name of the person it is assigned to must be locked up and kept safe and secure.

The research plan and operations manual must be followed to make sure that the study data are protected exactly as prescribed in the manuals.

h. Response to Participant's Questions

A data collector will meet many people, including prospective participants, existing study participants and curious onlookers not involved in the study, who will have questions about the study. Some people will not understand what "research" is, or will not know anything about the researchers who are leading this project. They may have all sorts of questions, some of which may not have anything to do with the study procedures at all.

Investigators will train data collectors to address the many concerns that are likely to be expressed by people. This is because, in the "field" on a day to day basis, it is the data collector who represents the study when talking with possible participants and the community at large. It is important that the data collector show proper respect to all individuals and do one's best to address concerns. A data collector must be patient and answer any question that a participant asks, so long as s/he knows the answer! A data collector should never answer questions for which the answers are not clearly known, because giving wrong information can be worse than giving no information, at least temporarily. If you are a data collector and a participant asks a question and you are not sure of the answer, here's what should happen: you should tell the person that you do not have a confident answer to the question; that you will ask the study supervisor the question; and that you will pass that answer on to the participant. This is very important because it shows respect to the participant and it makes sure that the information you pass on to the participant is accurate. When you think the participant has no more questions, you may ask, "Do you have any other questions?" to make sure that all questions have been addressed. If there are no more questions, then you may proceed.

2. Data Integrity

a. Respect for the Science of the Study

Data are the "product" of research. It is very important that the information collected, recorded, and stored by the data collectors is correct. Scientists will use these data to answer the research questions identified in the research plan. If the data are wrong, then the answers that the scientists produce will also be wrong. People whose lives may be affected by the results of the study may be put at risk, because the answers and actions that follow will be wrong. So it is very important that all data at all times are collected properly, recorded properly, and stored properly. If you make a mistake doing any of these things, it is important that you tell your supervisor right away so that the investigators or research team leaders know about it. They may be able to fix the problem, or they will know that some data may not be usable.

b. Collecting, Recording, and Storing Study Data

The research plan spells out the project objectives and how the research team will reach those objectives. The details of data collection and recording study data are included, and usually the study operations manual goes into more detail about how

those jobs will be done. The data collector must understand exactly how the data should be collected, and how they are recorded. The research team leaders will train the data collectors on this process. If the data collectors have any questions, they must not be afraid to ask them. In truth, if the data collectors do not ask questions when they are unsure of how things should be done, they will not be able to make sure that the data are correct.

Once the training is complete, the data collectors begin their job. Good data collection means following the instructions and accurately completing the data collection sheet. Proper recording includes making sure that the answers to questions are written in a legible and clear way. The data collector must record the information with honesty and accuracy. Extra information that is not identified in the data collection sheet should not be included. For example, if there is no space for "name" or "address", then these data should not be recorded on the data collection sheet. No information should be "made up" and recorded on the data collection sheet.

Proper storing of data means that all safety precautions should be taken while transporting the data to the ultimate storage place. Data collectors should not put the collection sheets down where they might be lost, stolen, or read by someone outside the research team. The data collection sheets should be given to the person responsible for storage, and that person should follow all the instructions to protect data confidentiality. If data are collected electronically, the same principles and rules of honesty, protection and care must be followed.

c. Deviations from Study Procedures

Sometimes a data collector is not able to follow study procedures through no fault of his or her own, and sometimes a data collector may make a mistake. It is very important to let the research leaders know about these problems because the research leaders have the responsibility to report these kinds of problems to the reviewing Institutional Review Board (IRB). There is no shame in reporting these kinds of problems. They happen all the time. It is not good, however, if the data collector fails to report these problems because it could mean that the data are not good, or that a participant has a problem with the study. It also means that the study supervisor will not be able to complete the report to the IRB.

A good data collector will communicate these issues to his or her supervisor and let that person decide what action to take.

The foregoing has been agreed to and accepted by authorized representatives of each one whose signatures appear below.

AGREED:

Title 1: General manager

Xiao Lin · Zheng
Trainee's Name (Print)

Xiao Lin · Zheng
Trainee's Name (Signature)

2014.2.6
Date

1370944277
Phone

459108889@qq.com
E-mail

Title 2: ~~Manager's~~ secretary

Ren Lan · Zhang
Trainee's Name (Print)

Ren Lan · Zhang
Trainee's Name (Signature)

2014.2.6
Date

18875001762
Phone

27832962@qq.com
E-mail

Title 3: banquet executive

Guang Jing Cheng
Trainee's Name (Print)

Guang Jing Cheng
Trainee's Name (Signature)

2014.2.6
Date

18875021756
Phone

1171189020@qq.com
E-mail

Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd
Address: Tianhe Rd., No. 35, Yubei Dist., Chongqing, China, 401147

培训声明

尊敬的爱荷华州立大学伦理审查委员会：

作为分别任职于重庆巴俞寒舍餐饮有限公司的总经理，经理秘书以及宴会主管，我们很乐意以主要研究成员的身份帮助官令为她的论文——“以推力拉力理论研究中国重庆顾客选择婚宴举办地点的消费动机因素”搜集数据。我们已经仔细阅读了“美国约翰霍普金斯大学公共卫生学院与人类相关研究的伦理学培训指南”。我们每个人都同意通过贯彻执行下列规定得到数据信息：

美国约翰霍普金斯大学公共卫生学院 与人类相关研究的伦理学培训指南 (9/2009)

本指南是用于培训将要参与与人类有关研课题的工作者。本指南主要是帮助约翰霍普金斯大学的项目负责人对其他相关研究人员进行培训，使他们的研究行为符合伦理学要求，并以符合伦理要求的方式去：1) 取得研究对象的知情同意，2) 通过对研究对象进行个人或小组的面谈、检查、身体测量，或以其他直接接触的渠道收集数据（以下简称“调查员”）。本指南所采用的特定的内容和语言水平，是为了帮助项目负责人向调查员传达基本的研究准则和相应的行为标准。

目 录

1. 在和研究对象接触中的道德准则

- a. 调查员的任务
- b. 尊重待人的重要性
- c. 自愿参与
- d. 知情同意
- e. 弱势人群
- f. 个人隐私
- g. 个人信息的保护
- h. 回应研究参与者（研究对象）的问题

2. 数据的完整性

- a. 尊重研究的科学性
- b. 研究数据的收集、记录和存储
- c. 研究过程的偏离

1. 在和研究对象接触中的道德准则

a. 调查员的任务

代替研究团队收集数据的研究人员是整个项目的代表。有时调查员是项目参与者唯一直接接触到的人。他们的行为决定了与其接触的研究对象对整个研究印象的好坏。

调查员有责任确保研究对象是在知情同意基础上提供研究所需信息的。他们还必须确保信息的收集记录准确无误。否则，研究目标将无法完成。为了保证项目进行顺利，调查员必须认真遵守研究计划、项目实施手册和其它与参与者有关的研究程序进行操作。

b. 尊重待人的重要性

作为研究团队的一部分，每个研究人员都必须尊重：

- 该研究项目的目标，
- 该项目的负责人，
- 该研究的参与者，
- 参与该研究的社区，以及
- 有助于实现项目目标而收集的数据。

科研项目最终将造福社会，但是研究课题组必须先要完整地该科研项目。每个研究团队成员在与社区参与者的接触中必须始终保持对对方的尊重。这包括尊重社区参与者的文化习惯、性别、年龄、社会地位、宗教信仰和其它独立的特征，以及他们提问的权利。科研项目参与者不承担必须帮助研究课题组的义务，所以如果研究课题组成员不尊重他们的选择权利，或不为他们提供最诚恳的态度和真实的信息，科研项目参与者将不会合作。

调查员以专业和尊重的方式收集数据会使每个参与者体会到研究项目的重要性。例如：

- 无论参与者是否同意参与这项研究，始终礼貌待人。
- 调查员需用清晰的声音提问。
- 在调查表上整洁地记录信息。
- 如果参加者提出了一个问题，请给与正确的回答。如果你不知道答案，但是可以从你的上级获得信息，如实告诉参与者你将在获得答案时告诉他们。
- 向完成了研究程序的参与者表示感谢。

c. 自愿参与

没有任何人必须要参加一个研究项目。如果某项研究包括了知情同意过程，被邀请的潜在研究对象有权利拒绝听取有关研究的内容，并有权拒绝参加该研究。即使已经加入了研究项目，参与者仍然可以拒绝回答调查中的某些具体问题，拒绝提供某项标本或者参加某项测试，或者决定退出该研究项目。征集参与者的研究小组成员必须负责确保参与者理解研究项目的目的和过程，完全自愿参加该研究，而不是因为害怕或其他原因被迫参加。

d. 知情同意

向可能被邀请参加研究项目的研究对象提供真实而准确的信息是进行有关人类研究的一个重要环节。知情同意是一个随着研究人员开始向参加者解释研究项目而进展的过程。知情同意的目的不仅是让参与者签署同意书和同意参加。事实上,知情同意的过程延续到整个研究过程;例如,调查员和参与者的每次接触都会有一个继续知情同意过程。如果参与者没有充分理解被要求做什么,他们便没有真正的“自愿”加入该研究。调查小组需要提前决定信息传达的“充分”程度和传达方法。负责知情同意的工作人员的任务是用参加者可以理解的语言,让他们了解这项研究的目的、过程、潜在的风险和研究的好处。所用的语言和沟通方式应该保证参加者能够理解。这种讨论应该给参与者足够的时间来提出问题,并思考和决定是否要参加研究。

有时,研究人员需要不时地向参与者确认他们是否已经理解研究内容和研究涉及的其它方面。负责获取知情同意的工作人员有时需要向参与者提问,以确定他们了解了些什么,理解的是否正确。另外,因为参与者可能看起来身体不适或有点困惑,但没有明确说出来,所以研究人员也应该留意观察参与者的肢体语言。如果观察到这些反应,研究人员应该告知他/她的上级人员来获得更多的指导。

e. 弱势人群

在征集某些人群参加项目时,需要特别注意和关心,因为他们的一些情况,使他们自己很难理解听到的内容,以及提供知情同意。例如,儿童需要额外的“保护”,同时他们的父母必须为他们作出某些决定。患有老年痴呆症的成人可能不明白你要求他们做什么。项目负责人准备的研究计划和实施手册应该告诉你如何接近这些人群和是否征集他们参加该项目。研究组成员必须非常小心地按照规则征集弱势人群参加研究,因为大多数时候弱势人群不能自行做出决定。如果该研究将征集不能自行做决定的参与者,必须有授权看护者或其他适当的代表人能代理他们决定。

f. 个人隐私

研究人员必须理解和尊重个人拥有的隐私权。即使文化中没有提倡或承认“隐私”的概念,尽可能地保护隐私仍然是很重要的。例如,如果没有被邀请就不能进入别人的家中,可能就是当地的一个习俗。研究组必须尊重这一习俗。或者,一个调查员在访问一个家庭时,可能会吸引好奇的旁观者。他们的出现可能会分散调查员和调查对象的注意力而对重要的数据收集过程产生不良影响。研究组必须预见到这个问题,并使它最小化。调查员要求保证个人隐私的举动,保证了对参与者的尊重,因为他们的家是家人生活的地方,而不是公共场所。

研究组成员也必须尊重参与者的个人隐私,避免造成任何不必要的尴尬或不适。涉及敏感信息采访,应该在他人不能听到问题或答复的地方进行。体检不应该在他人可以看到的场所进行。此外,有些话题是私人的敏感话题,如性生活、个人健康,或参与者不希望当众谈论的想法。

g. 个人信息的保护

如果研究参与者透露了参与者的个人信息,原本是高度保密的个人隐私就可能成为公开信息。也就是说,个人隐私可能受到侵犯。如果研究项目以外的人得到这些信息,参与者可能会遭遇尴尬、失业、法律问题,甚至来自社会各方面的伤害。研究人员应负责保护参与者避免受到这种伤害。

必须保证研究参与者所提供的个人信息的安全。任何无适当授权的人都不应看到或获取这些信息。如果这些信息是记录在纸上的,那么在锁进文件柜之前这些文件应该受到保护。只有经研究负责人授权的工作人员才能翻阅和处理这些

信息。如果是电子信息，必须采取一切必要的防范措施以防止未经授权的人访问它。

有时，可使用随机调查数字标识数据，以保证无人知道数据是哪位参与者提供的。任何把数字与相关参与人的姓名联系起来的文件都必须被锁好以保持安全可靠。研究人员必须严格按照研究计划和实施手册的要求和内容保证研究数据的安全可靠。

h. 回应参与者的问题

一个调查员会遇到许多人向他/她询问关于研究的问题，这些人包括潜在的参与者、现有的参与者，以及好奇的旁观者。有些人不理解什么是“研究”，或不了解研究项目人员的任何情形。他们可能有各种各样的问题，其中一些可能和研究过程没有任何关系。研究负责人需要事先培训调查员，让他们恰当回答人们可能提出的各种问题。因为，在日常的工作现场，是调查员代表了研究团队的所有人出现在参与者和整个社区面前。重要的是，调查员要尊重他人并尽其所能地回答问题。调查员必须有耐心，并准备回答任何参加者提出的问题。如果调查员知道答案，应当场回答。如果调查员自己不十分清楚答案的问题，则不应自行作答，因为给出错误的信息，比暂时无法回答会产生更大的负面作用。

如果你是调查员，当研究参与者提出了一个你不知道答案的问题，你应该告诉他你不确定，但你会把问题转达给上级，并将答案传达回给参与者。这一过程非常重要，因为一方面表明你尊重参与者，另一方面也确保你传递给参与者的答案会是准确的。当你觉得参与者没有问题了，你可以问“您还有其它问题吗？”，以确保所有得疑问都已经解决了。如果没有其它问题，那么你可以继续下一步。

2. 数据的完整性

a. 尊重研究的科学性

数据是“研究的成果”。确保收集、记录，和存储数据的准确性是至关重要的。科学家们将利用这些数据来回答在研究计划中提出的问题。如果数据是错误的，那么科学家们得到的答案将是错误的。由于这些结论和由此产生的行动是错误的，人们的生活可能因为错误的研究结果而受影响。所以，任何时候任何数据，正确收集、记录并妥善贮存数据都是非常重要的。如果你犯了一个错误，必须要马上告诉你的上级，以便让项目负责人或其他研究团队负责人知道。他们也许能解决这个问题，或判定有些数据可能无法使用。

b. 研究数据的收集、记录和存储

研究计划应该详细阐明该项目的目标，以及研究组将如何达到这些目标。数据的收集和记录的详细方法也应该包括在内，通常研究实施手册更加详细地列出这些步骤。调查员必须清楚理解究竟如何收集和记录数据。研究组负责人应当给调查员进行这方面的培训。如果调查员有任何问题，应当及时提出。事实上，如果调查员对具体怎样操作不清楚却不提问题，他们将无法确保数据是正确的。

一旦培训结束后，调查员开始数据收集工作。正确的数据收集需要按实施手册要求一步步完成并将数据完整无误地记录在调查表上。恰当的记录包括将答案用清晰、明确的方式写下来。调查员必须记录真实而准确的信息。调查员不得记录未在调查表上列出的额外信息。例如，如果调查表上没有“姓名”或“地址”这两栏，这些数据就不应该记录。调查表上不应该有虚构的信息。

恰当的数据存储指在数据传输到最终存储处的过程当中，采取各种安全防范措施。调查员不能把调查表放在可能会丢失、被盗或被研究组外的人看到的地方。调查表应由专门负责保管的人按事先定好的规范进行保存，以保护数据的保

密性。如果数据是通过电子方法收集的，也应遵循同样的原则去维护其真实性、保密性和安全性。

c. 研究过程中的偏差

有时，一个调查员因为非个人原因而无法遵循原定的研究步骤，或者犯了错误。很重要的一点是必须将这些问题告知项目负责人，因为研究项目负责人可能有责任把这些问题报告给伦理审查委员会（IRB）。报告这些问题不要有羞耻感，这类问题会经常发生。调查员不上报这些问题是不对的，因为这可能意味着数据无效，或者某一个参与者在研究中有问题。同时这也意味着项目负责人无法将问题报告给伦理审查委员会。称职的调查员应该将这些问题报告给上级，让其决定采取何种行动。

以下是已经同意并接受上述规定的受培训人签名:

同意:

职称 1: 总经理

郑时林
受培训人名字 (书面版)

郑时林
受培训人名字(签名)

2014年2月6日
日期

13709442777
电话号码

459108889@qq.com
邮箱地址

职称 2: 经理秘书

张仁兰
受培训人名字 (书面版)

张仁兰
受培训人名字(签名)

2014年2月6日
日期

18875001762
电话号码

27832962@qq.com
邮箱地址

职称 3: 宴会主管

程光英
受培训人名字 (书面版)

程光英
受培训人名字(签名)

2014.2.6
日期

18876001756
电话号码

1171189020@qq.com
邮箱地址

重庆巴俞寒舍餐饮有限公司

地址: 中国重庆市渝北区天河路 35 号 邮编 401147

APPENDIX C. QUESTIONNAIRE

A Survey of Motivations for Choosing Wedding Banquet Venues

Dear Participants,

Welcome to the Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. I am a graduate student in the hospitality management program at Iowa State University in the United States. **I am conducting a survey to investigate the factors influencing consumers' motivations for choosing the Bayu Humble House as their wedding banquet venue.** It would be greatly appreciated if you would take 10 minutes to fill out this short survey. You may skip any questions you do not feel comfortable answering.

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study. Your participation is anonymous. Your responses will be used for research purposes only. We ensure the confidentiality of the information provided by participants in the survey. This project has been approved by Iowa State University's Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects.

As an incentive for your participation, you will enjoy a 5% discount off the service fee of an evening wedding banquet at the Chongqing Bayu Humble House F&B Ltd. This discount cannot be combined with other discount offers. This discount is not redeemable for cash and is not applicable toward previous purchases.

I greatly appreciate your valuable time in participating in this survey.

Sincerely,

Ling Guan

Master's Degree Student

Department of Apparel, Events, & Hospitality Management

Iowa State University

E-mail: guanling@iastate.edu Telephone: (515) 817-3697

Section I. The purpose of this study is to investigate the motivations of decision-makers to choose Bayu Humble House as the wedding banquet venue. If you are the new couple, or the new couple's family and friends who involve into the decision making process of selecting a restaurant/hotel as the wedding banquet venue, please finish the following sections. Otherwise, please quit the survey now.

☐ Decision-maker

☐ Non decision-maker

Section II. We are interested to know the importance of the attributes of Bayu Humble House as your motivations to select it as the wedding banquet venue. Please rate each item with 7-point Likert rating scale: *1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree.*

Assessment Items	<div>Strongly Disagree</div> <div>Neither</div> <div>Strongly Agree</div>						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Employee attitude	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Equipment expenses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Cleanliness	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Food Quality	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Availability	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Decoration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Lighting/ambiance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Location of venue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Size of venue	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Audio equipment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Menu variety	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Beverage price	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Food price	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bridal room facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Photography service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Bridal limousine service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Parking space	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section III. We are interested in your personal reasons except the restaurant attributes House to motivate you to choose Bayu Humble House as the wedding banquet venue.

Please rate the following items with the 7-point Likert rating scale: *1=strongly disagree to 7=strongly agree.*

Assessment Items	<div>Strongly Disagree</div> <div>Neither</div> <div>Strongly Agree</div>						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To increase my social status							
To visit a place that my friends also visit							
To enhance communication with relatives and friends							
To satisfy the desire to be somewhere else							
To relax spiritually							

To visit a restaurant that I have not been to before	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To experience a different wedding celebration tradition	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To be away from home	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To celebrate a wedding in a place that would impress my friends and family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Indulging in luxury	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To relax physically	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To choose the reception location that will fit my	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

needs and personality							
To choose the location that will match my desired image of wedding reception	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section IV. There are just a few more questions about your demographic information.

1. What is your gender?

☐ Male

☐ Female

2. Your Age :

☐ 18-25

☐ 26-30

☐ 31-35

☐ 36-45

☐ 46-55☐ 56-65☐ 65 and above**3. Education level:**☐ High School☐ Some College☐ Undergraduate college degree☐ Graduate degree or above**4. Your relationship to the new couple**☐ Bride or groom☐ The new couple's parents☐ Other family members of the new couple☐ Friends of the new couple☐ Colleagues of the new couple**5. Personal monthly income:**☐ ¥5,000 or less (\$813 or less)☐ ¥5,001- ¥10,000 (\$814-\$1,626)☐ ¥10,001- ¥15,000 (\$1,627-\$2,439)

☐ ¥15,001- ¥20,000 (\$2,440-\$3,252)

☐ ¥20,001- ¥25,000 (\$3,253-\$4,065)

☐ ¥25,001 or more (\$4,066 or more)

6. Wedding banquet budget:

☐ ¥50,000 or less (\$8,130 or less)

☐ ¥50,001- ¥100,000 (\$8,131-\$16,260)

☐ ¥100,001- ¥150,000 (\$16,261-\$24,390)

☐ ¥150,001- ¥200,000 (\$24,391-\$32,520)

☐ ¥200,001 or more (\$32,521 or more)

7. Acceptable menu price per table (excluding beverage costs):

☐ ¥1,500 or less (\$244 or less)

☐ ¥1,501- ¥2,500 (\$245-\$406)

☐ ¥2,501- ¥3,500 (\$407-\$569)

☐ ¥3,501- ¥4,500 (\$570-\$731)

☐ ¥4,501- ¥5,500 (\$732-\$894)

☐ ¥5,501 or more (\$895 or more)